REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4 and 6 stand objected to noting an informality. The letters (c) and (d) in claim 1 were inadvertently omitted in the last rendering amendment of claim 1. By amendment, these step labels have been inserted and overcome the Examiner's objections.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the early prior art rejection based on Kishi et al. Applicant also appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 10-12 and 14 contain allowable subject matter. For reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-9, 13, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the CoreConnect Bus Architecture referred to by the Examiner as "IBM." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained in the last response, in order to establish that a claim is anticipated, the Examiner must point out where each and every limitation in the claim is found is a single prior art reference. If even one limitation is missing from the reference, then it does not anticipate the claim. The IBM document fails to disclose all of the features of the rejected claims.

The Examiner relies on the section in the IBM document entitled, "Design Toolkits," on page 7. This design toolkit is an example of the known technique for checking that a component will interface correctly with a known bus specification described on page 2, lines 6-15 of the instant application. Page 7 of the IBM document indicates that design toolkits are available for each of several on-chip buses. Thus, the user must initially select an appropriate toolkit for the type of bus structure for the design being tested. Each toolkit represents a test environment, and the user simply selects one of the toolkits depending upon a particular on-chip bus to be tested.

The user must also generate one or more test sequences called "testcases" in the IBM document. A Bus Functional Compiler is used to translate these testcases written in a bus functional language into simulator commands executable by the master and slave models within the toolkit. So in summary, the user generates a test sequence and selects a toolkit to apply the test defined by that test sequence.

Regarding independent claim 1, the IBM document fails to disclose "reading a configuration file containing predetermined parameters identifying the type of the device and capabilities of the device" and "employing a configuration engine to dynamically generate a test environment for the device by creating selected test components which are coupled via the bus with a representation of the device to form the test environment, the test components being selected dependent on the configuration file." The IBM document does not disclose dynamically generating the test environment for the device because the user simply selects between a number of predefined, static toolkits. There is no configuration file that contains predetermined parameters identifying the type of the device and capabilities of the device described in the IBM document. Nor does the IBM document select test components depending on such a configuration file during the dynamic test environment generation.

Although the Examiner refers to lines 1 and 2 of the DCR Bus section on page 7 of the IBM document as allegedly teaching the claimed configuration file, the DCR Bus section has nothing to do with the design toolkit section. To the contrary, the DCR Bus section simply describes reading and writing of certain status and configuration registers through the Device Control Register (DCR) Bus. Such reading and writing of registers through the DCR Bus is unrelated to the subsequently-described design toolkits, and certainly is not related to the claimed dynamic generation of the test environment. Moreover, registers that are read by way of the

DCR Bus do not contain "predetermined parameters identifying the type of device [to be tested] and the capabilities of the device," as recited in claim 1.

The IBM document also fails to disclose the configuration engine recited in claim 1. The user merely selects one of a number of available design toolkits in the IBM document. There is no configuration engine that *dynamically generates* "a test environment for the device by creating selected test components which are coupled via the bus with a representation of the device to form the test environment."

Lacking multiple features of independent claim 1, the anticipation rejection of claim 1 and its rejected dependent claims is appropriate and should be withdrawn. Independent apparatus claim 18 recites similar distinguishing features, but framed in the context of an apparatus. For example, the IBM document fails to disclose a memory that stores "a configuration file containing predetermined parameters identifying the type of the device and capabilities of the device." Nor does the IBM document disclose a processing unit that is arranged to dynamically generate "a test environment for the device by creating selected test components which are coupled via the bus with a representation of the device to form the test environment, the test components being selected dependent on the configuration file."

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

NIGHTINGALE
Appl. No. 10/084,145
October 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____
            John R. Lastova
            Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:at
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

- 10 -